CLAUDIA RUIZ:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the Operations, Finance and Budget Working Group Workshop Call on Thursday the 12th of August 2021 at 20:00 UTC.

On the call today, on the English Channel, we have Holly Raiche, Maureen Hilliard, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Ricardo Holmquist, Judith Hellerstein, Justine Chew, Marita Moll, and Sébastien Bachollet. We have Harold Arcos on the Spanish channel.

And from staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Becky Nash, Victoria Yang, Devin Reed, and myself, Claudia Ruiz, on call management.

Bukola Oronti has also just joined the call. And we do have RTT on today's call. I will put a link in the chat so you can all follow again.

And before we begin, I would like to remind everyone to please state their name for transcription purposes and so the interpreters can identify you on the other language channels.

David Kissoondoyal and Aziz Hilali have just joined the call as well.

We have Spanish and French interpretation on today's call. Our Spanish interpreters Paula & Veronica, and our French interpreters are Isabelle and Jacques.

Thank you all very much. And with this, I turn the call over to you, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, and welcome. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Just to remind people where we're up to, we've completed the poll on the top initiatives from an ALAC or from a working group perspective.

We started with the MSM, as facilitating diverse and inclusive participation. [Really,] the second one was to strengthen ICANN community decision making, which ties in very nicely with the first. The third, very close to the second—Universal Acceptance.

Planning at ICANN was forth, but actually we're going to do a lot more on that today. And monitoring legislation was fifth. So those are the issues we're going to be looking at in the context of fitting that in with one of our main tasks that's coming up because, for those of you who are looking at the timetable for this group, starting really in September/October/November, what we are doing is looking at and commenting on the planning processes for both IANA and ICANN.

And in that regard, Marita, I will be getting back to you. But our next week, we're going to be looking at strengthening the MSM. And we've been waiting for a long time for Marita's slides. We're finally going to look at them, which is terrific.

But today is the second of the two parts for the presentation that Becky will give on the ICANN Planning Team Prioritization Framework. We looked at it in our last meeting, and Becky's very nicely going to do a little bit of a summary of that.

And then the second part today, this will be, really, in preparation for this group responding to that process and being, actually, part of

incorporating that in some of our response to the beginning of the budget responses. Today we're looking at the prioritization techniques, the systems and tools that are being looked at and talked about, and then a pilot.

So with that, Becky, thank you again for agreeing to talk to this group. And I will hand over to you. Thank you.

BECKY NASH: Thank you very much, Holly. For the record, this Becky Nash from ICANN Org Planning Department. And I will share my screen now and just ask for confirmation that my screen can be seen by everyone.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes. Looks fine, thank you.

BECKY NASH: Thank you for confirming that. So, thank you very much for having the Planning Department here for a Part 2 of our consultation process on the Planning Prioritization Framework design.

So just as a recap, I have the agenda from the presentation that was sent out from the first meeting that we had where we broke the presentation up into two pieces. So we are using the same materials, just so everyone is aware of that. And what I am going to do is just first step back and ask if there are any newcomers that wanted the general overview again at all.

HOLLY RAICHE: Becky, I don't see any hands.

BECKY NASH: Okay. Thank you, Holly, very much. I think we will want to just stop on a few of these slides that we covered last time we were together just to highlight again that the project scope clarification is that we are seeking consultation on a proposed list of components, or what we call design elements, that we can work together to decide upon so that then a draft process can be written up and published back out for community consultations.

So we're just highlighting that we are working together. And that's why this a very interactive, brainstorming-type session. And then all community members will have many opportunities to provide us feedback because this will be an iterative process. And that means we will revise it and be flexible and meet the needs of Board, Org, and community.

And I just wanted to highlight that we are in the midst of FY23 planning where we are launching for that annual cycle. In this prioritization process, we're going to talk about how this going to be included in the annual planning cycle, and that it's not fully implemented for FY23 because we haven't had our opportunities to consult and brainstorm together and collaborate on this.

So these slides are all available, and should there be any questions or feedback, again, I'm on this call along with my colleague Victoria Yang.

And we will be sure to put our e-mail address in the chat for any follow ups or feedback that anyone would like to provide us.

I am now going to talk just slightly about the timeline for the annual planning process. So with the operating initiative of Planning at ICANN, we have an end-to-end view of the planning processes which incorporate strategic planning, operating planning, and financial planning. And it does run from a calendar year perspective from a January period starting with the strategic outlook trends. And then we move through into the beginning of ICANN's fiscal year. And then we're planning for yet a whole other year in advance.

So this the timeline for planning, and we currently are approaching this step of … August is where the IANA plans are under development and will be posted for public comment. The reason I'm talking about this timeline at this time is to highlight that the project that we're here to talk about—which is the Planning Prioritization Framework—once implemented, we are suggesting that this will be a new step in the annual planning cycle. And it would be suggested in the May/June timeframe that the community and Org come together to review all of the work and how to prioritize it. And that is the subject of our consultation where we have discussed the methods, the design, the timing. And we did hear from the last time that were here …

And I'm just going to jump to, sorry, slide 15 where we talked about the scope of the work. We talked about the participants and the frequency. So the overall timing that I was just showing on that previous slide was suggesting a new step in the annual operating planning process to take place in May and June with the community so that we can identify the

priorities for the next, technically, five-year plans and one-year plans. And that was the subject of our consultation in our last meeting about frequency.

So one of the things that we have heard is, yes, once a year; yes, up front in the annual planning cycle; and perhaps maybe a check-in and consultations throughout the year. Meaning checking in on status, but that we would not recommend doing a full prioritization again unless there was some sort of reason that new work or something has come into the landscape.

So in general just some of the feedback is maybe twice a year, but definitely, as we've all indicated, once per year. And that was what we heard in the consultations when were with this group last time.

So then we talked about the scope, and we had quite a good amount of interaction regarding the scope, meaning its community recommendations and community work that has been Board approved and ready to be contemplated for designing the implementation. And then there is, of course, ICANN Org-initiated work that would be things like the ITI or the NSp or compliance systems that are also large projects.

But this would be at the level of the planning process for all of the Org's operating plan and budget, and it doesn't include smaller, more functional projects. And that is also what we all discussed, and we've got some good feedback on that.

And then one other key element was the participants. And we received a lot of feedback about participants, and this is really an area that is so important for a new step in the annual operating planning process. And I

know that we will continue to discuss the best approach for structuring the roles and responsibilities, and also how to structure the participation and the outcome of a prioritization process.

And we did make a reference, which is also in the appendix, to some suggestions that have come out of the ATRT3 recommendations about a structured way to have participants on a committee. And we're very interested in hearing feedback on an ongoing basis from all of the community about how best to identify and clarify, in this annual planning process, the participants.

And we received some very good feedback about, yes, structuring; and then also, should there be another public comment. And there was a comment that we received about why couldn't we do both. And that was a great interest for us to hear.

And just so that everybody knows that all of the consultations … We are writing up all of the feedback that we've received, and we're continuing to do consultations ongoing. But we did receive some feedback that having a separate public comment would lengthen the operating planning process again which, you know, the required timeline for public comments. So that's something that, if there is any feedback, it would be really interesting to hear about that.

And I don't know. I'll pause to see if anyone has any comments that they would like to share at all, or feedback, just so that we continue to receive feedback on it. Would two public comments in the annual operating and financial planning process be too lengthy of a process for community members?

And I do see a comment from Cheryl Langdon-Orr, thank you. "For me, both makes sense. Obviously, I still hold the ATRT3 recommendation as paramount." Thank you for that.

Oh, Sébastien, I see your hand up. Please, go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Becky. Yeah, but I still have trouble to understand really where we end up with, in one hand the recommendation—including ATRT3 recommendation—and in the other hand what we are talking about here, the prioritization of the operating plan. That's, I will say, my first question because I don't see how, as a community, we can just talk about one and not the other. And how we go from recommendation to be included in the operating plan.

My second question is that when you suggest to have a planning prioritization in May/June it's for the next fiscal year or it's to start the process of the next plus one fiscal year? That's my questions, and I don't know if it's clear what is my question. But feel free to ask me questions if it's not clear enough. Thank you.

BECKY NASH: Thank you very much, Sébastien. Victoria, did you want to reply to Sébastien from ICANN Org Planning?

VICTORIA YANG: Yeah, sure. I do have a comment for the first question, but I didn't really understand the second question. Perhaps after I provide my comment to the first one, Sébastien can recap the second question.

So the planning process improvement has two aspects. Right now the Planning Team is working on the Prioritization Framework which will help us to basically plan better, which is one of the improvements under the operating initiatives of Planning at ICANN.

You know that the Planning at ICANN Operating Initiatives were initiated in 2019 during the development of the 21-25 Operating Plan. And the ATR3 recommendation and adoption, I think, came after that. There might be overlapping … I'm not saying that these two will not crossroad off each other. Perhaps there will be, but the intent of the Prioritization Framework was initially initiated under the planning [at] ICANN Operating Initiative.

That's what I want to basically bring up, and the timing of those two.

BECKY NASH: Thank you. Sébastien, did you want to elaborate?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. Thank you very much. Okay, the answer brings me a very big question. And it's what, in one sense, Cheryl already wrote, "ATRT3 recommendation as paramount."

And I want to be straight here. ATRT—from my point of view, but I am sure that I am not the only one—is a most important review. And what

recommendation came out of any of those ATRTs must be taken as a first from everything else in this organization. Yeah, the fact that it was a [inaudible] change with the how the Board is taking the reviews, and so on and so forth. But what is inside ATRT3 must be taken as a first to whatever other groups have done. That's my comment on the answer.

I just want to be sure. I'll try to elaborate about my question. When we talk about—in this document, in this slide—Planning Prioritization, May/June, do we want to plan and prioritize for something that will start the first of July of the same year? That's means 2022 if we are in June 2022. Or is it meant to start the overall process to allow us to be prepared for the first of July 2023, if we are in June 2022?

That's my question because I don't see how we can be, at the same time, putting things into the operating plan and in the same time prioritize them just at the same time that the Board will accept the budget and the operating plan and a strategy plan also. Thank you. I hope it's clear, but I'm not sure.

BECKY NASH: It is very clear. And thank you, Sébastien. It helps us identify how better on a timeline to show the fiscal year. So the Planning Prioritization process is not for the fiscal year that would have just been adopted and go into effect in the following July. It's actually for a year after that. So it's in this current timeline. And it might make it easier if we think about, if we had done this in May and June, it would be for FY23 even thought, with ICANN's fiscal year starting from July 1st going through to June 30th, we are now in FY22.

So, yes. Thank you very much. The observations and the feedback that we've received is highlighting which fiscal year we're planning for. So if we look at … And I like to take FY24. So I'm skipping a year because next January, we will launch again the beginning processes for an integrated planning process to then obtain a Board adoption and community period for fiscal year 24.

And we're indicating that this step would be something of a new structured step based on this design project that we're working on now for the community, Board, and Org to come together and look out at the horizon of what work have we completed, what work is ongoing and already prioritized in the current plans, and then what work do we want to put as the high priority into the next following plan.

So that, I hope, that answers that question. And Sébastien, please go ahead. Your hand is up still?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: No, no, sorry. I was listening to you and not taking care of my hand. But thank you for the answer. And, yes, I think you need to find a way—I don't know how—but a way to talk about something in year one and something in your two or three or four. Because if not, it gives a wrong impression, at least for me. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Sébastien, could I draw your attention to what Victoria said, "Correction, what I meant is for Current FY+1." And actually, I think if we think of that

added to this plan, that makes a little bit of sense. So, look, thank you Victoria and Becky for clarifying that.

BECKY NASH: Yes, thank you. And thank you very much, Holly, and for all the comments that we received.

So I am wondering at this point, then … We will have opportunity for continued discussion. And what our roadmap for this project plan includes is an iteration of a written proposal after identifying all the feedback from the consultations and then a written proposal. So I just wanted to highlight that this will be an ongoing conversation because we do want to make sure that we get agreement on the roles and responsibilities and then how to actually structure the process and the logistics, which is a little bit more from the Planning Department standpoint—how we schedule the meetings, how we collect the data in a Prioritization Framework.

With that I'm going to now move to the second part where we are continuing with the consultations. And the next three areas are outlined on the following slides, which are: prioritization techniques or models, report systems and tools, and then a suggestion about a pilot process.

For a Planning Prioritization Framework we have, as one of the objectives, a selection of agreed upon prioritization techniques. So a selection of 1,2,3—many techniques. That's how we're viewing it at this point. Meaning that we have some slides here, first on our selection process, and secondly on the processes or techniques themselves. And this one of the design elements in this process design.

EN

So the Planning Prioritization project includes the research and selection of techniques for collaborative decision making. We acknowledge that there are many factors to consider when setting priorities, and there are many benefits of using techniques for decision making.

So they help rank problems or issues generated through brainstorming or from Board approval or community reviews. They help apply a criteria that's important to the organization or sub-groups or working groups. And then they are tools designed to be quick and easy to use for making choices.

And we would just like to highlight that we've received some feedback that "quick and easy" is important, and also "easy to understand," so that we're not data scientists bringing up a very complicated model that we might get lost in, type of thing.

So at the start of this operating initiative of Planning at ICANN and for this project, the Planning Team researched 11 prioritization techniques that are readily available. And these are known techniques. Meaning that we did not devise anything ourselves. And I'll speak a little bit to that later in a few slides.

But in order to get started with this desktop research that we did, we felt that we needed to have some guiding principles and criteria. So first we looked up prioritization techniques and assessed using guiding principles. And using these principles, I think which are on the next slide, we looked at the fact that seven did not appear to be applicable to ICANN or the multistakeholder model or a not-for-profit organization.

And so based on that, we had four techniques that were considered as potential prioritization techniques or models.

And we also are highlighting that a combination or maybe more tailored techniques could also be considered. It's not just a one size fits all. It may make sense to use two or to adjust one or two to make better sense for the ICANN Planning Prioritization process.

And then we evaluated the four techniques, just in terms of general pros and cons, and using suggested criteria to help determine applicability to ICANN's context. So we first outlined, or we are outlining here guiding principles for informing the criteria in the selection process.

So, "inclusive of diverse stakeholder perspectives and a process that offers a way to foster collaboration and consensus-building in reaching prioritization decisions." So that is a guiding principle—inclusiveness.

Techniques that reflect or can embody a mission-driven approach to prioritizing work that aligns with commitments, core values, and strategic objectives of ICANN. And that is another guiding principle that we outlined.

It provides a systematic process for participants to understand the complexities surrounding potential project work. And that is complexity in the level of effort. I have heard things like "hard and easy." Or another usage of it is, "Is it a big effort like three t-shirt or is it a one t-shirt size?" That type of thing.

And it enables understanding of potential synergies and trade-offs of different prioritization decisions. And this last one, we like to highlight

that decision making is hard and it does require choices. Meaning if it's this, then it's not this. Not to say that they're not all important areas of activities and they are to be scheduled, but it's really a which goes first type of process.

And the evaluation criteria that we used, as I made reference to, was to help determine how applicable a particular model is as it relates to ICANN's operating environment.

So, "easy to understand and avoiding unnecessary complexity, and suited for supporting decisions efficiently" is really something important. Relevant to mission-driven organizations like ICANN. And collaborative in developing agreed-upon parameters to inform prioritization decisions.

So number three is really that it's a collaborative but that it moves things forward through the model to a discussion about, "Is this a priority?"

I'll just pause for a minute and see if there's any reaction or anything in the chat.

HOLLY RAICHE: Becky, you just briefly most your sound. Or at least I have, but what I'm getting from the …

Judith is very supportive, as am I, for these principles. But I would ask anyone else to respond to these principles in general and to how they assist ALAC, amongst other SO/ACs. Cheryl is happy. I think we can say that, at the moment, we're all pretty happy with these principles.

Do you want us to go further and perhaps provide further feedback from another discussion? Maureen's also in favor. And I don't see any hands, so I would say that we're all …

Oh, Sebastian, your hand is up. Go ahead, please.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry. Yeah, I like the fact that there is a reference to a different way of working specifically to ICANN, the multistakeholder, the mission-driven and so on. And the complexity, also. It's important that we decrease the complexity in the organization in general and in that work.

One of my questions, I will say, I would suggest [inaudible] is the timing, is the fact that we can do that in a certain period, in a short time. We don't need five years to decide what is important. And that's what I would say, if I can say, that one additional point I would like to see here. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Sébastien. Marita, and then we'll go back very quickly to Becky. But go ahead, Marita.

MARITA MOLL: Yeah, hi. Sorry, I'm having all sorts of weird gremlins today and my sound cut out exactly when you were talking about something I should be doing. I hope I don't have anything to do. But anyways, I think this great that you're starting out with the principles, and they're well thought out. They seem to be as inclusive as I can think of at the moment.

And the evaluation criteria, particularly interesting. Number three "collaborative in developing agreed upon parameters to inform prioritization decisions." Are you planning on setting up, or have you thought about setting up certain systems or groups within groups that would enable this kind of work? I mean, there are already a lot of groups doing a lot of work. This is another thing. Have you figured out how this is going to be implemented in that way, getting people together to talk about the criteria?

BECKY NASH: Thank you. Holly, would you like me to respond?

HOLLY RAICHE: I'm going to first respond saying we've got to move very quickly, but Marita, that is a very good question. And I think it's something that we are going to have to take offline and think through because I'm very wary of our very short answer because I think it's a very important question. And Marita, I think this something that we've raised. How we do this is just something we need to think through. I'd like to get through the slide deck and come back to that question and give it the time we need, but I'd like to get through your slide deck first.

MARITA MOLL: Thanks, Holly. Let's just leave that on the table.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes, please.

BECKY NASH: Thank you, Holly. So I will continue to go through the slides. I've made note, definitely, of the comment from Sébastien about timing. Again, meaning techniques that permit us to follow the planning prioritization process in a timely manner. And I hope it's clear that if we are looking at, at least a frequency of once a year, timing would be within the planning cycle.

And then I have made note of Marita's comments, and I believe that is linked to the participants of the entire process again. But I do see Marita's hand backup. Or shall I go forward?

MARITA MOLL: Old hand, sorry.

BECKY NASH: Thank you. Okay, so we just had a conversation about the guiding principles and evaluation criteria, and we will continue to receive feedback on that.

And then the concept of using two techniques or a hybrid. That's just an overall comment, again, about let's not think that together we're designing just one process or using just one technique. It could make sense that we use two or a hybrid. And thank you. I see some comments about that.

Here is now an overview of the prioritization techniques that were researched. So as I indicated, as a team in Org, we looked at available

research for prioritization techniques that looked as if they fit within a nonprofit like ICANN and, hopefully, within a multistakeholder model. There were 11, and we have that research available which will also be part of the paper that we will be publishing.

And we then as a team—Org—looked at the fact that using this criteria in these evaluation principles, there appeared to be four that were the most likely candidates to further evaluate.

Now one of the things that I would like to highlight is that these techniques which are developed and published use terminology from their original information. And as we work together and evaluate what kind of a technique would work best for an ICANN Planning Prioritization process, we would then suggest renaming things like "customers" or "managers" or terminology that might be used in the research to tailor it to ICANN's ecosystem and how we speak about the multistakeholder model.

So with that, on the next set of slides that we've provided are just the highlights of the different techniques that were used—I mean researched, excuse me. So we've listed the name, and we have a high-level description, and then some pros and cons that were developed from the ICANN Org Planning Department perspective. And this is all what we would like to refine and hear feedback on and collaborate on.

So this first one is called Hierarchy of Purpose. It examines the purpose, priorities, projects, people, and performance. Another key highlight is that it emphasizes alignment across, it says, "organizational

leadership"—again, we have not tailored these to any ICANN works—and cascades to the rest of the organization. It clarifies what is most important, in priority order, providing clear direction to inform all decision-making, especially when there are multiple competing priorities.

So they put "Applicability to ICANN". It seems very appropriate for a mission-driven organization. It may require dialogue with the community, Org, and Board to reach collective understanding and agreement on the Hierarchy of Purpose.

So a Hierarchy of Purpose, again, that would then be that set of parameters that would have to be first labeled and vetted and discussed and agreed upon to then use a model.

I see, Holly, you have a comment there. [inaudible].

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah. I like the idea. Of course we've talked about initiatives, the importance of initiatives, and we spent a bit of time with them. And I think, for me the question was, how did the initiatives—when did they come into account? And if we're using this, if we're talking Hierarchy of Purpose, it says that the initiatives have to be part of that process. That if you're actually evaluating, the things that you want to achieve have to be kept in mind. That's just my thought.

And go ahead, please, but I was just wondering how we tie initiatives into planning because we're spending time on initiatives just to make

sure that in fact if we spend the time, that somewhere in there they're taken into account. [Thank you].

BECKY NASH: Thank you, Holly. And this is a really good reminder of some of the feedback that we discussed at the last meeting. And we just want to say, from ICANN Org's planning standpoint, all of the feedback helps us communicate better in the future; and a very interesting point because when we talk about operating initiatives that are included in the operating plan, they are the major projects and activities that support the achievement of ICANN's adopted strategic plan.

So we also thought that it is interesting to look at almost the hierarchy of the work that we have in the operating plan because of the fact that those initiatives which are to support the strategic plan … It is the strategic work of ICANN to achieve that five-year plan, and so they almost are all prioritized. Even though they have different levels of phasing. And when the scope of the work is done and when we show progress measurement, that is going to be something that we would like to a better discuss about the fact that that is key work.

Now what we're talking about are other Board-approved actions and activities that we now need to schedule, so I would like to make sure that we make note of how to better respond to that one.

I also do see that there's lots of good discussion about the pros and the cons. So, let's see, I think Cheryl has listed that, "The con can be adjusted within our unique model because of how recommendations are created by and with the community input."

Okay, so just to be clear. When we put a pro, it appears that this model—and we can change the language when we adopt a model—has a clear hierarchy of purpose. And then the con here is "unclear of where and how the bottom-up community approach fits since it emphasizes top-down." So that would be a con of this type of model of hierarchy cascading down. So, very good input there.

And I see a hand from Judith. Please go ahead.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes. Thanks so much for this great technique. My question is, what happens if it's for maybe a high? [inaudible] we are [weighting] different initiatives with high/medium/low, and one of the times if we prioritize it as [something that is] very high but other communities say it is low for them or not as high. How does that work within the prioritization techniques? Do you take an average of what communities think? Or how does that work?

BECKY NASH: Thank you very much, Judith. Yes, the model will be a layer of information, and then from that input the data will need to be synthesized and reviewed to come to another layer of consensus about what is the highest priority across all of the community. And these techniques and this list of prioritized work which, as we've discussed, will most likely have the diversity of different stakeholders, and then it's a discussion of ensuring that there is a component of the model to help either identified dependencies or urgencies; to then state that one item appears to be higher priority than another.

And I do see a couple of comments. It depends if you use an iterative decision making or maybe a top-down decision making in the model. And I really support these comments that remember a hybrid model may end up being used as well. Again, using the guiding principles but not too overcomplicated. We don't want to get lost in a data scientist's world.

But that's a very good point because for those of us that were here at the beginning of this session, we were reiterating that this a step up front in the planning process to gain consensus and collaboration on producing a list that is received as input into the Draft Operating Plans. There is a time before it goes back to Board approval for adoption, that the entire community will have an opportunity to have that public comment on the draft plans.

And there are maybe some dependencies that Org has identified in trying to prepare the Draft Operating Plan. And all of that will be very open and transparently discussed and reported back out to the community.

HOLLY RAICHE: We've got one comment additional from Marita, and then I think we need to get through the slides because we'd like to talk about all of them. So go ahead, Marita. And then Becky, go ahead.

MARITA MOLL: Okay. It's so, so very difficult to make sure that we're all talking about the same thing here. And Becky mentioned that were talking about the

operating initiatives, about 15 operating initiatives, that we evaluated. But here, as far as I understand, that is not what we're talking about.

For example, one of the operating initiatives is to support the multistakeholder model and evolve it. Well, underneath that there are a whole lot of things. There's diversity, there's do a Holistic Review, there's consensus [inaudible]. There's a whole lot of those things. And each one of those has to be evaluated underneath that. And every other—ATRT3 and all other kinds of groups that have been making recommendations. There are dozens and dozens of things that have to be evaluated under that. And that is what I think this refers to.

BECKY NASH: Thank you very much for your comment, Marita. And I am going to take an action item to come back to that, just about the operating initiatives and work that supports the strategic plan versus projects that are eligible for prioritization in the Annual Operating Plan and where they need sources of funding to complete them. So I think it's a little bit of a drawing of the continuum of work. And we'll come back and be a little bit more precise on that for you. It's very good feedback for us.

I'm just going to walk through these slides. Again, we encourage dialogue and feedback, and we can set up several other discussions. And again, as we go through our consultations, of which we have a slide on, we'll be hearing feedback. So I don't want anybody to feel that this the only time to read/learn/provide us feedback. So please, I just want to make that very apparent.

So again, we sub-selected, out of 11, 4 that we evaluated. And this technique would be one step in the designed process. So the process is going to have end-to-end framework of how to complete a prioritization process, and one element of it is using a series of techniques or hybrid to help a group collaborate and come to a decision-making process.

So, Transparent Choice: Project Prioritization. Again, the name has the word "project," so it's a lot more in the space of projects. It is a bit more in-depth and complex approach using stakeholder approved criteria and weighting. So this is where, again, each technique needs to have the development of the parameters within the technique of, what are our values? And here it is, what is our stakeholder approved criteria and how are they weighted?

And the weighing acknowledges that, ultimately, decisions are often judgment calls—and there was a comment about that in the chat—that represent inherently subjective views of the people making the decisions. So this one's very open and has that element of weighting, to acknowledge that a scoring has to happen.

So the Applicability to ICANN, "Appropriate for a mission-driven organization." And it could be useful on its own or applied in combination with another framework. And the reason that statement is listed there is because of that weighting and more in-depth, complex approach.

So the pro is "comprehensive and systematic." Another pro is "criteria and weighing create clear expectations." The "participatory approach

with diverse stakeholders," and then "improved transparency and opportunities to generate buy-in."

The cons. Maybe that it's overly complex and time consuming. So, highlighting that word in our discussion because we want something swift. Especially as a new step in the operating planning process, we need to accomplish that work so that the community can provide input of what Org should take into consideration as developing detailed operating plans and budgets.

This may be confusing for some stakeholders. Again, these are our perceptions of reading and looking at it.

And then "could end up over-sharing information." Maybe the probe of why that's important to you. And, I mean, this one might not fit in ICANN's ecosystem. I think we're very open and transparent about what our values are, but that's just something that comes from the actual writeups.

And I do see the cons about, again, the different parts of the community preparing for the aspect of this sort of process being used. And that's very, helpful for us as well.

So I am going to continue down, just so that we just touch briefly on these techniques. And then I'll pause and we can have some additional dialogue.

So number three here is a technique called Team Gantt, like Gantt chart. So it's a simple, 5-step process based on assessing—again, the words

from the original documents—"business impact, importance, urgency, and bandwidth."

So one thing here is bandwidth. And of course that makes a lot of sense when we're getting towards adoption. One thing to understand is that the full bandwidth of completing something may or may not be available at the time we're reviewing projects eligible to be prioritized because the detailed plans haven't been developed yet. And that has to do with how we schedule our work, how we do a design implementation phase, and then new activities like ODP and other types of mechanisms. So I just want to highlight that one.

So, Applicability. "Can be adjusted for nonprofit organizations, and some features of this approach may be useful to consider in creating a hybrid framework for prioritization.

The pros. Simple, easy to follow. The prioritization is based on urgency and importance. And a pro is that it considers bandwidth, but I'm just highlighting from Org's standpoint. In some cases we don't have the detailed bandwidth as of yet.

Cons. May be geared more toward private industry or business sector and for-profit in terms of business impact. Terminology is unclear and leaves a lot of room for interpretation and subjectivity when we want to change it to fit our model because we plan to tailor the wording to fit our multistakeholder model. And I guess, we would have to translate "business impact."

I do see a request that has come in for sharing the slides. I'm just going to pause for a moment and ask Claudia whether or not the slides from

the July 29th are available on the website. And maybe we could post a link.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: [inaudible].

HEIDI ULLRICH: Becky, this is Heidi. Sorry, Claudia. I'm not sure if that was you. I'll just quickly confirm that they are on today's agenda, and they're also on the workspace for the OFB-WG. Thank you.

BECKY NASH: That is great. I hope that the participant that is requesting those has the link for all of that. So thank you. Sorry I was not able to respond earlier.

Okay, so that's Team Gantt. Again, there was a five-step process here. And again, a scale of business impact would need to be developed and agreed upon.

So if we go to the last one that we've highlighted. And we're not excluding the other ones. The research will be available if there is anything that any participant sees that may be worth looking at. Again, what we're really looking for is the agreement on testing out some models together so that we can design a process that, once implemented, helps us collaborate for prioritization.

This last one, #4, Risk-Cost-Value-Effort, and it's RCVE. And this a matrix is best used when an organization needs to prioritize a series of

important issues and decide which one it wants to focus on to achieve their strategic and operational goals.

When using the RCVE matrix, the leaders or the project managers need to carefully consider what comes out of the prioritization and use that information as a guideline and not a definitive answer. So this one is really talking about a hybrid already, is the way I look at that.

And then the Applicability to ICANN that we've noted is that ICANN's Strategic Outlook program already uses a similar matrix to determine whether an annual trend may require a change to the strategic plan or as input into the operating plan. And it seems to work well in the context of collecting all of the strategic outlook trends data.

The four criteria/matrix may be a bit limiting for other criteria such as relevance to the mission and values or dependency on other projects. So it might need to be supplemented with some additional data, as we've indicated. Maybe a hybrid.

Simple, easy to understand, calls for collective stakeholder clarification and articulation of the definitions for each criteria, which is stakeholder-centric.

Does not allow space for additional criteria beyond the Risk-Cost-Value-Effort. And we've already addressed that maybe a hybrid are using it on a preliminary basis. And I do see a comment from Cheryl that "perhaps this prioritization technique better belongs in other parts of our processes." And I apologize. "IMO." I'm sure what that stands for.

HOLLY RAICHE: In my humble opinion.

BECKY NASH: Oh, thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: There's nothing ever humble about my opinions, Holly. It's just "in my opinion."

HOLLY RAICHE: I added that for a little bit of gentleness, thank you.

BECKY NASH: Thank you. So there does seem to already have a consensus with this particular one, so that the ranking then moves forward. And again, I think we've highlighted the complexity of prioritizing amongst different communities and community members. So it sounds like, potentially, this one we should drop from our list and maybe just look at three. That's an option.

So we have prepared this matrix of using those criteria that we discussed. And I would say it sounds as if a lot of feedback has been that hybrid is something that we really should consider together to collaborate on. And I just want to confirm that. And then, also, we've heard a little bit about RCVE potentially not being very applicable.

And I'll just pause here, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: First of all, thank you for the rundown with this. It's produced a lot of comment. And probably there will be more. I think people are still getting their heads around those four and the discussion. So, certainly, I welcome any initial discussion. But it's something that, because these slides will be on our meeting page, people can go back to these and have some additional thoughts and possibly get back to you as well.

BECKY NASH: Absolutely. And I think I have to doublecheck if I attached a separate document as well as part of the write-up. But I've mentioned that we do have a paper on these techniques, and I think that I can certainly circulate that as well. It's a lot of reading.

And thank you, Marita. Again, this Becky Nash from ICANN Planning. A lot to think about here. We agree.

HOLLY RAICHE: And, look, if I could ask Claudia and Holly to just make sure that the additional paper that you've referred to winds up on our meeting page as well so that, for people interested in these techniques, there's additional material to read because clearly these are all important ways to think about how do you prioritize. Because, certainly, this is what we've been talking about in this working group. The initiatives, where do they fit into the process? And then how do you evaluate? So this all part of a very important discussion for us, and additional material would be very much appreciated.

I think, Marita, yes, a talk or a part of the next meeting to actually talk about or leave space for this discussion would be useful because it would give everyone a little chance to think through once we have identified the things that are important to us and provided our input, how do you make that decision? So it's really an important discussion to have, and I certainly would appreciate Marita's suggestion—how we might have that as an item in our next discussion. And we can always have discussions on either Google Doc or whatever.

Look, could I take it offline to say how we extend this discussion? Because it's obviously really critically important for us as well as, I suppose, other SOs and ACs.

But, Cheryl, your hand's up. Go ahead, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. Thanks, Holly. As you know, I wanted a couple of minutes from you, Holly, to just bring everyone up to speed on what the small team is doing regarding the OFB's activity, remembering that the OFB has been tasked by the ALAC to bring forward our own set of priorities from the huge existing laundry list of priorities that is already in play.

I'm just going to, if you don't mind … Do you want me to cover that now? Because I think it would actually feed into what Marita was talking about and our ability to have a conversation about all of this really useful information we've been given today from Becky and her team.

HOLLY RAICHE: Well, it wasn't on my agenda, but I wrote it in.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sure, okay.

HOLLY RAICHE: So why don't you go ahead [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Do you want me to do it now then? Or I can [wait].

HOLLY RAICHE: [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: What I'll do is I'll share my screen, if you don't mind.

HOLLY RAICHE: No, no. Please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: All right, okay. So what I'm going to show you all, hopefully—

HOLLY RAICHE: No, wait a minute. It's not [inaudible]. There we go. Thank you. It wasn't on my screen. I was worried.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible] now. It's got so much further to go to get between you me, Holly. Being in the same country and all.

HOLLY RAICHE: I know.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I just wanted to briefly take you all through and remember … Well, first of all, a couple of things. Some of you who have been in these briefings before will recognize this spreadsheet but see that, hang on, some of the tabs are different. So those of you who've been not living and breathing the weekly activities of the small team, we've gone through, with the leads—with the chairpeople where possible or the vice-chairs if not available, and certainly in some cases with the shepherds—for all the recommendations, for all of the reviews that are going to feed into any form of the prioritization process.

It's been a huge amount of work, but what we've done is to—not totally by accident—but very interestingly looking at this current meeting today. We've been using a hybrid design between hierarchy and prioritization. So here we are. Our data science categorizing there is that what we've been doing is a mix, is a hybrid, of hierarchy and prioritization. And so we did all that hierarchical work, and you've seen some of that.

We are still adamant that overall, above all, the recommendations from ATRT3 are predominant and must be preeminent. And so that also

means that this prioritized exercise is of utmost importance as far as we are concerned.

What we now have—and that's reflected in the High tab you'll see down here—we now have high priorities, medium priorities, and low priorities. We've got some charting which I'll just give you a brief look at because it's our intention to—with my steam-driven computer, it will eventually go to charting I hope—to give you a set of as-simple-as-possible views with the support of the data behind it. All right?

So the charting's not coming up here well right now, but rest assured there's a whole lot of bar charts and things there which means, for people who haven't been living and breathing this stuff, there's a nice, simple overview with pretty colors that they can go, "Oh, that's what these ALAC/At-Large is interesting in."

Let me take you to what we're doing now, and that is putting this next level of filtering into the system. So we've got all the highs together, all the mediums together, and all the lows. And remember they're coming from ATRT—although they all belong in High—SSRT, RDS, CCTRT, Work Stream 2, the whole kit and caboodle.

What we are now doing is going into this more hierarchical exercise where we're looking at bringing in … And I don't know why the screen is still black, other than my ancient computer. But what we're doing is going through and applying a new filter to all the mediums, all the highs, all the lows. And in this case, it means that some of our listings are going

to get smaller. The reason they're going to get smaller is at least twofold, as we've discovered so far.

First of all, in things like the SSRT, we already have the recent Board resolution where there's a group of them that are not going to be adopted or are pending. And so we can take those out of our current set of considerations. All right?

And Claudia, if you can display the document and go to the Medium priorities, I will start leaving the share screen. And your computer hopefully is connected to a better Internet connection than mine is today.

So what we then will have is less to deal with. But we will still give you a grading, a set of ranking, within what is medium to us, within what is low to us, and within what is high to us.

The other thing that's also going to make this part of jobs slightly easier is working with the leads and shepherds from each of the groups. We see that each group was tasked or scoped very, very differently. And to that extent, to that end …I'll stop sharing my screens so Claudia can get hers up.

To that extent in, for example, CCTRT—which might I say has the largest number of high priority issues of all of them—we will be reducing that number because the leading CCTRT who works in our small team—that's Jonathan—is able to, with his shepherds, regroup some of those into small clusters. So it would be the one treatment for several separate recommendations.

So there's a little bit of light at the end of the tunnel. And I just wanted to bring you all up to date on that, but just if you can just pop into medium or high. It doesn't matter. Either of the priorities. But pop to the SSRT section, Claudia, because that shows how we have treated the data that …

No, no, no. Not that table. No, where you were in high, medium, or low. I don't care which. No. Oh, my darling, Claudia. Go to the very first tab. High will do me. Okay. Scroll down. I wasn't clear. My apologies. Scroll down until we get … You're going to be quite some down, a long way down. About a hundred rows down. You will see that we haven't removed things that the Board, for example …

There we go. That'd be [perfectly okay]. Oh, backup. Perfect. We haven't removed things that the Board has rejected. We've left them there for having a transparency and data point of view, but we've noted what the status is and why we won't be dealing with them as they go through this next level of filtering.

But I thought it was interesting. Marita, you, for example, have been working very closely with [inaudible] MSM stuff on here, so you are very used to this system and what this system actually is which—I hope Becky and Victoria find amusing—is in fact a hybrid between hierarchy and prioritization modeling. [Actually,] it allows the RCVE stuff to be applied a little bit later.

Now that works for our community, and that's fine. But you may find that the Business Constituency in the GNSO who might be much more based in an agile workspace and their preparation may indeed want to

use an entirely different model and do a SWOT or an RCVE or whatever. And I think that should be okay if each AC and SO does the preparation to feed in to your more elegant and time-bound prioritization modeling. And hopefully one that fits perfectly with ATRT3 recommendations or prioritization.

Okay, that's it for me, Holly. Thanks.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you, Cheryl. I have to say that it is a really important task for this group to actually get our heads around where we go with all of the recommendations and so forth. So I appreciate the work of your small group, and I think there's plenty of [thought for] that this group has to take up. We appreciate the sort of synergies between Becky's presentation and yours in terms of how do you do prioritization when there's a lot ahead, a lot to think through, and a lot to decide what is important. And, obviously, we all [had a hand in it].

Meanwhile, let me get back to Becky to say that this has been really useful and really thought provoking. We've already had some discussion online saying we need time. And what I think Maureen and I will have to do is think through how to make sure that we allow time in the next discussion. Possibly we can take our 60-minute meeting and turn it into a 90-minute meeting so that we have some time to provide feedback to you because your timeline is the end of September. And I know that, from the chat, a lot of people would like some time to think about and work through what we will say in return.

But in the meantime, can I say thank you from all of us, Becky? It's been really useful and very thought provoking, and I note that you'd like to hear back from us by end of September.

And thank you, Cheryl. What I probably need to think through and work through with this group is how we actually start to address your recommendations because we've had a bit of discussion already talking about the importance of, particularly, the Holistic Review but some of the other recommendations to come out of the other reviews that we, as ALAC, find important. So we have to probably make that an item that is worth more than just five minutes, and how we deal with those.

So in the meantime—thank you, Becky—our next meeting … And Marita, as you're aware, I keep saying, "Well, Marita's going to talk to us for the next meeting," so I'll have a chat with you offline or e-mail of you offline because we also have to start discussing the operating initiatives. We have identified the ones that are important to us and that will be important when we consider some of the comments on planning.

So for the next meeting—which we haven't set a timeline yet—but Claudia and Heidi, we can set a timeline which will be in a couple of weeks' time. Marita, if you're okay, we'd really like to start the discussion on operating initiatives and start with the MSM because that was top of everyone's list.

Also, Cheryl, I'd like to have a little chat on how We can bring some of the discussion from your chart back into this group so we can discuss this. And also, Becky, how we can get back to you with some responses.

So we've got a work ahead of us. But in the meantime, can I ask for any final feedback before I let people have 10 minutes off this meeting? And do I see any hands? Do I see any hands?

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay, Cheryl. First of all, Becky, your hand's up. Go ahead, please.

BECKY NASH: Yes, thank you very much, Holly. This Becky Nash from ICANN Org Planning, for the record. I first of all really want to thank you and your membership for permitting us to present and collaborate on this. And I really want to thank everyone for all the input. It's been a tremendous amount of good comments and feedback for us on this project. And we are available to come back and consult and work together on this, so we will definitely schedule some more time.

I think, in reviewing the slides, the feedback, whatever is easiest for the group. We can either come back and in here at all verbally if there are some additional comments or points that the members would like to make to us. And I just want to highlight that this the beginning of our work together. We want to get to the point of having a proposed designed framework to receive formal public comment on, and we don't want to take years—as I heard Sébastien said—of course.

So we also want to acknowledge that our suggestion is a pilot so that we can get into some of the logistics of hands-on experience such as it looks as one of your sub-groups has been doing. And we really value hearing

that experience. So again, thank you very much and we look forward to collaborating on this.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you very much, Becky, from all of us, as you've been really helpful. And I'm quite sure that we will continue collaboration, but this has been a very useful two-part presentation. And the slides are on our meeting page for anyone who wants to go back and look at them. So thank you again. Thank you to you and Victoria. And we very much appreciate the time, effort, and listening to us. It's been very useful. Thank you.

Okay, Cheryl. Go ahead, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks. I appreciate the opportunity, just for two very brief points. First of all, just for Becky and Victoria. Hopefully they won't have gone before they hear this, or they can someone can tell them about it. But I really would like this group, Holly, to understand that they almost underplayed the work that will have gone into that desktop review. The paper that they've put together [inaudible] I'm really looking forward to [inaudible] things and look at them from the very real needs of all that [inaudible] like ICANN. So it's a lot of [kudos] that should go to Becky and her team for that work. So I just wanted that recognized.

And the other thing is, I just want to point out, Holly, that of the group you've got here of the OFB, there are only about three names that are not regular attendees in the small teams work. So you actually do have a

lot of buy in already to what will be brought back to the OFB in more completed form. Just so you know that it's not a small team of three people. It's a small team of 13 and staff and other visitors being brought in from the review team. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. And Marita, go ahead, please.

MARITA MOLL: Yeah. Thanks, Holly. I want to echo what Cheryl said. I can only imagine the hours of research that went into looking into all of those types of evaluation plans. Yeah, that is a lot of work.

Now what I wanted to say is also that we here in this group need to be careful to prioritize what we're trying to do. I want to say that getting involved with the evaluation and how this evaluation system is being set up was one thing that we specifically mentioned and spoke to in our last comment on the budget FY22-25, or whatever. It was a big part of that, and I think that this is wonderful and we really are getting to know how this is going to evolve.

And I think it's a perfect and specific time to really have some input there, so I think that we should … And because we've got a September deadline, we should prioritize being involved in this at the moment. And some of the other stuff can be put aside because it doesn't have a deadline like that.

| HOLLY RAICHE: | Well, thank you, Marita. I think you're absolutely right. We've got a September coming up, and Ricardo's going to come into his own whether he likes it or not because we're going to start to have … Starting from September, if people will look at the—I'm sure you have—the website and [look at] the timeline. It's really from September through December that we are looking at plans and planning and numbers. And the value that we have from looking at the operating initiatives is to have a context in which we can actually respond to the numbers. So the work that we have done, the work of this committee, is really going to be completely focused for the next probably three or four months. But having at least the start of a discussion on initiatives will actually help us focus a little bit better on the sorts of responses that we have to the budget. So to me, the discussions about the operating initiatives which are a part of the planning process is really critical. And that's why I'm really looking forward to looking at the MSM and how this which was everybody's top-of-the-line discussion point for importance, if we can start with—I would probably say next meeting—the work that you've done on MSM and then start to relate that to how we're going to start responding over the next three or four months to the budgets that are coming out, both the PTI or the IANA one and ICANN Org. So, yeah, we do have our work cut out for us.

But I do appreciate this. Because we're called OFB, we do have a role at some point in looking at and commenting on some of the stuff that's coming out of those other reviews. And some of that, actually, we may just flick back to the Policy Working Group. Not sure.

So are you comfortable, Marita, for the next time spending a great deal of time on the work that you've done with the MSM model? |

MARITA MOLL: Holly, I think we should talk about that offline.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay.

MARITA MOLL: [inaudible] going to get us right now.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. Happy to do that. And in the meantime, we are absolutely on time. So with the next meeting, we're going to be talking about operating initiatives and preparing for—and, Ricardo, maybe you can be part of that as well—preparing for the work that we have ahead of us in looking at both the IANA and ICANN Org budgets.

                       But in the meantime, any last questions before I declare this meeting closed and thank you for your time? Okay. And Heidi, the next meeting will be in a couple of weeks' time. And could we work on a date, hopefully sometimes close to this time in two weeks' time. if that would be okay? Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, noted. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE:	Thank you. Okay, well thank you, everybody for your time. And we will talk in two weeks.
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	Thank you.
HOLLY RAICHE:	Have a good rest of the morning, afternoon, or evening.
CLAUDIA RUIZ:	Thank you all very much. This meeting is adjourned. Please enjoy the rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]